DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 641 EC 122 528

AUTHOR Davis, Paul I.: Todd, Anita
TITLE Gifted and Talented Workshop: Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Ypsilanti Public Schools, Mich.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 31p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Leaders: *Gifted: *Opinions: Parents: Parent Workshops: *Participant Satisfaction: *Program Evaluation: Tables (Data): *Talented Students: Teachers: Teacher Workshops: Test Results

ABSTRACT

The evaluation report of a gifted and talented workshop for teachers, parents, and community leaders is presented. Results of the pretest and posttest of the participants are provided. Pretest findings indicated, among other things, that a majority of educators felt that they had a fair understanding but needed to know more: that, among parents and community leaders, there was a wide range of knowledge: and that the majority of all groups were fully committed to students with whom they were directly or indirectly involved. Posttest results showed that all groups perceived cognitive growth on all indicators tested. Evaluations of the four speakers revealed that the majority of participants felt the speakers were all either good or excellent in their presentations. All participants rated the total workshop experience as either good or excellent. The workshop agenda and list of participants, as well as the assessment and evaluation instruments and a poem written by a participant are appended. (PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181641

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EVALUATION REPORT

GIFTED AND TALENTED WORKSHOP

August 20-31, 1979

Ypsilanti Public Schools

Sponsored and facilitated by:

Title VII Office
Ypsilanti Public Schools
Paul I. Davis, Coordinator

Workshop coordinator:

Anita Todd
Consultant for Gifted
Washtenaw Intermediate School District

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Paul Davis
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC122528

GIFTED AND TALENTED WORKSHOP

EVALUATION REPORT

Background and Purpose

The Title VII Office of the Ypsilanti Public Schools, Paul I. Davis, Coordinator, sponsored and facilitated a Workshop on Gifted and Talented for teachers, parents and community leaders from August 20 through August 31, 1979. The goal of the Workshop was to provide participants with knowledge and training that would involve them in support of local efforts for the gifted as well as to aid in the process of identifying gifted students, particularly those from minority or disadvantaged backgrounds.

The Workshop was conducted in two sections. Teachers, representative of each of the elementary buildings, met from 8:30-11:30 a.m. daily for a total of 30 contact hours. A second group, composed of parents and community leaders, met from 7:00-9:00 p.m. daily for a total of 20 contact hours. All sessions were held at the Instructional Center, 210 W. Cross St., Ypsilanti.

Sessions were conducted by the Workshop coordinator, Anita Todd, Consultant for Gifted and Talented, Washtenaw Intermediate School District and four guest speakers: Dr. Joseph S. Renzulli, University of Connecticut; Dr. Percy Bates, University of Michigan; Barbara Lavery, Lincoln Consolidated Schools; and Gloria Downing, Livingston Intermediate School District. The Project Focus teachers, Bette Halman, Tom Tobias, and Chery Wilbanks, also presented an overview of current program efforts for identified students in Grades 1-6. An agenda for each section of the Workshop and a list of participants is provided in Appendix A.

Content objectives of the workshop were: 1) to become knowledgeable of and sensitive to the behaviors of gifted, talented and creative children; 2) to become knowledgeable of and sensitive to the educational, social and emotional needs of the disadvantaged gifted; 3) to explore methods of identifying gifted and disadvantaged gifted children; and 4) to explore methods of providing for the education of the gifted--administrative, curricular, and instructional.

Evaluation Design

Two instruments were used on a pre-test/post-test basis at the beginning and conclusion of the Workshop. The first was designed to assess overall knowledge and commitment to programming for gifted and talented. The second, more specific, instrument was designed to assess and measure perceptions of cognitive growth.

A speaker evaluation instrument was used to evaluate each of the sessions conducted by the four guest speakers.

An additional instrument was used at the conclusion of the Workshop to examine perceptions about the overall structure and impact of the Workshop.

The assessment and evaluation instruments are provided in Appendix B.

Evaluation results are reported on the following pages in this order:

I. PRE/POST - EDUCATORS

II. PRE/POST - PARENTS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS

III. SPEAKER EVALUATION

IV. TOTAL WORKSHOP - EDUCATORS

V. TOTAL WORKSHOP - PARENTS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS

An original poem by a workshop participant is included in Appendix C.

I. PRE/POST - EDUCATORS

Responses on the first assessment instrument (see Appendix B) indicated that a majority of the educators entering the Workshop (10-12 out of 15) felt they had "a fair understanding but needed to know more" in the categories of concepts, philosophy and programming for gifted and talented students. A majority entered the Workshop with a high level of commitment to both district-wide provisions for gifted and to provisions for students with whom they are directly or indirectly involved. Seven of fifteen checked "fully committed" to district-wide provisions; eight of fifteen checked "fully committed" to students with whom they are directly or indirectly involved. Another four of the fifteen checked "committed, but I still have some reservations" in both catergories.

Results of the post-test to assess overall knowledge and commitment at the conclusion of the workshop are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

EDUCATOR POST-TEST OF KNOWLEDGE AND COMMITMENT

	HIGH 5	4	3	2	LOW 1	MEAN
To what extent has your knowledge increased?						
1. concept of 'giftedness', i.e. definition, characteristics, identification	10	3	-	-	-	4.8
2. rationale (philosophy) for differentiated provisions for education of G/T	8	5	-	-	-	4.6
3. ways to provide quality differentiated programs for G/T	7	5	1	-	-	4.5
What is your present level of commitment?						
4. to district-wide provisions for G/T	7	5	-	-	-	4.3
5. to specific provisions for G/T students with whom you are directly or indirectly involved	8	3	1	-	-	4.6

Pre-test/post-test comparisons of perceptions of cognitive growth are shown in Table 2. In order to arrive at a mean, a numerical value was assigned to each response on a scale of 1-4 as follows:

"I do not have any background in this area." (1)
"I have a fair understanding but need to know more." (2)
"I feel fairly confident of my understanding of this." (3)
"I have a strong background in this area." (4)

Numbers within the grid indicate the number of responses in the category for pre/post. For example, 9/1 would indicate nine responses in that category on the pre-test and one response in that category on the post-test. A total of fifteen participants completed the pre-test at the beginning of the Worshop; thirteen participants completed the post-test at the conclusion of the Workshop. However, not every participant responded to every item.

Participants were also assessed on their knowledge of individual contributors to the body of knowledge concerning various aspects of gifted education (theory, writings, models, etc.). Pre/post results follow.

6/12	Terman	/2	Marland	2/3	C. Taylor
10/13	Binet	1/6	Meeker	2/3	F. Williams
8/13	Bloom	1/11	Gallagher	6/13	Renzulli
1/6	Krathwohl	4/7	Sisk	4/3	Feldhusen
4/11	Guilford	5/13	Torrance	5/9	Kaplan

Table 2

EDUCATOR PERCEPTIONS OF COGNITIVE GOWTH

No background	Fair understanding	Fairly confident	Strong background		PRE-TEST MEAN	POST-TEST MEAN
1	10/1	4/9	3	1. Characteristics of the gifted	2.2	3.2
4	9/1	3/12		2. Characteristics of disadvantaged gifted	1.9	2.9
2	6/1	6/9	3	3. Methods of identifying gifted	2.3	3.2
5	10/3	9	1	4. Administrative provisions for gifted	1.7	2.8
4	10/2	10	1	5. Curricular provisions for gifted	1.7	2.9
3	12/2	10	1	6. Instructional provisions for gifted	1.8	2.9
1	13	1/11	1	7. Assessing learning styles	2.0	3.0
1	12	2/11	2	8. Creativity - what it is; how fostered	2.1	3.2
1	12	2/12	1	9. Inquiry process or teaching styles	2.1	3.1
1	11/2	3/10	1	10. Questioning for higher level thinking	2.1	2.9
2	12/3	1/10		11. Future problem solving	1.9	2.8
2	12/5	1/8		12. Structure of the Intellect	1.9	2.6

II. PRE/POST - PARENTS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS

Responses on the first assessment instrument (see Appendix B) indicated that parents and community leaders entering the Workshop were widely varied in their level of knowledge of concepts, philosopy and programming for gifted and talented students. Their level of commitment to district-wide provisions for gifted was generally high. Of the five participants, three checked "fully committed" in this category, one checked "committed, but I still have some reservations, and one indicated "do not have sufficient data at this time".

Results of the post-test to assess overall knowledge and commitment at the conclusion of the Workshop are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

PARENT/COMMUNITY LEADER POST-TEST OF KNOWLEDGE AND COMMITMENT

	HIGH 5	4	3	2	LOW 1	MEAN
To what extent has your knowledge increased?						
1. Concept of 'giftedness' i.e. definition, characteristics, identification	3	2	-	-	-	4.6
2. rationale (philosophy for differentiated provisions for education of G/T	2	1	1	-	-	4.3
3. ways to provide quality differentiated programs for G/T	2	2	1	-	-	4.2
What is your present level of commitment?						
4. to district-wide provisions for G/T	4	1	-	-	-	4.8
5. to specific provisions for G/T students with whom you are directly or indirectly involved	3	1	1	-	-	4.4

Pre-test/post-test comparisons of perceptions of cognitive growth are shown in Table 4. In order to arrive at a mean, a numerical value was assigned to each response on a scale of 1-4 as follows:

"I do not have any background in this area." (1)
"I have a fair understanding but need to know more." (2)
"I feel fairly confident of my understanding of this." (3)
"I have a strong background in this area." (4)

Numbers within the grid indicate the number of responses in that category for pre/post. For example, 2/1 would indicate two responses in that category on the pre-test and one response in that category on the post-test. A total of five participants in the parent-community leader group completed both the pre-test and the post-test. However, not all participants responded to every item.

Participants were also assessed on their awareness of individual contributors to the body of knowledge (theory, writings, models, etc.) concerning various aspects of gifted education. Pre/post results for the parent-community leader group follow.

3/5	Terman	/3	Marland	1/2	C. Taylor
4/5	Binet	/4	Meeker	/3	F. Williams
2/4	Bloom	3/3	Gallagher	2/5	Renzulli
2/3	Krathwohl	2/2	Sisk	1/2	Feldhusen
3/5	Guilford	2/5	Torrance	/4	Kaplan

Table 4

PARENT/COMMUNITY LEADER
PERCEPTIONS OF COGNITIVE GROWTH

No background	Fair understanding	Fairly confident	Strong background		PRE-TEST MEAN	POST-TEST MEAN
1	2/1	1/2	1/2	1. Characteristics of the gifted	2.4	3.2
1	3/2	1/2	1	2. Characteristics of disadvantaged gifted	2.0	2.8
2	2/3	1/1	1	3. Methods of identifying gifted	1.8	2.6
2/1	2/2	1/2		4. Administrative provisions for gifted	1.8	2.2
2/1	1/1	2/3		5. Curricular provisions for gifted	2.0	2.4
2/1	1	2/4		6. Instructional provisions for gifted	2.0	2.6
2	3/3	1	1	7. Assessing learning styles	1.6	2.6
1	2	1/5	1	8. Creativity - what it is; how fostered	2.4	3.0
2	2/2	1/2	1	9. Inquiry process or teaching style	1.8	2.8
2	2/1	1/4		10. Questioning for higher	1.8	2.8
2	2/3	1/2		11. Future problem	1.8	2.4
2/1	2	1/4		12. Structure of the Intellect	1.8	2.6

III. SPEAKER EVALUATION

Evaluation responses to each of the four outside speakers who presented workshop sessions follows. While the total number of evaluation returns for each speaker is shown, chart totals may not always balance with the total, since some respondents did not respond to all items. (Totals include responses from both the educator and parent-community leader groups.)

Table 5

DR. RENZULLI'S PRESENTATION
(19 returns)

CATEGORY	Excellent 5	4	3	2	Poor 1	MEAN
organization	11	6	2	-	-	4.5
content	15	3	1	-	-	4.7
delivery	11	7	-	-	-	4.5
materials	6	12	1	-	-	4.3
conceptual gain	9	8	2	-	-	4.4
practical gain	9	7	3	-	-	4.3

Comments:
--I'm very impressed with the revolving door theory!
--I liked his use of practical examples in his talk. It helped me understand things a bit easier.
--I do not feel that I am in any position to give any evaluation of Dr. Renzulli. He was so fantastic that we need a Dr. Renzulli in every town U.S.A.
--Revolving door approach was new idea but questions were not really answered well. He knew his material but had difficulty with its practical application for the parents and students of Ypsilanti.
--I feel that I am extremely limited in my knowledge of his field. However he did increase my understanding.
--Dr. Renzulli was vintage in his field--his major premises are impeccable, and his delivery is delightful. First rate.
--I truly enjoyed this speaker. His delivery was interesting! I learned a lot about various program organizations and was especially impressed with his revolving door idea.
--Very good.
--He's coming along. Very imformative!
--Most informative. Many new concepts presented.
--Enjoyed the presentation; but expected more within the area of identification and implementation of psychological factor related to the triad.
--Enjoyed his relaxed delivery. "Revolving door" policy-very interesting concept.
--Interesting - would like to hear more about the Revolving Door concept.
--Very stimulating. Gave me a great deal to think about.
--He's an excellent speaker, but I'd like more specifics.
--Sound philosophy!

Table 6

DR. BATES' PRESENTATION
(18 returns)

CATEGORY	Excellent 5	4	3	2	Poor 1	MEAN
organization	6	8	4	-	-	4.1
content	6	10	1	1	-	4.2
delivery	5	10	3	-	-	4.1
materials	2	7	5	3	-	3.5
conceptual gain	6	5	7	-	-	3.9
practical gain	6	3	7	2	-	3.7

Comments:
--Interesting and informative. However, more information may have been given to deal with testing of different cultures.
--Convincing and understanding.
--Agree: Any instrument is flawed - need to know those flaws then utilize the instrument accordingly. Very sensitive to children.
--Very interesting.
--Still did not convince me about IQ's etc.
--Dr. Bates stayed afloat in a restless sea.
--I feel Dr. Bates should do more homework in detail when speaking with parent groups. Also, in his capacity, his arrogance should be more subdued.
--I thought he spoke according to his experience in life and his environment.

Table 7

BARBARA LAVERY'S PRESENTATION
(15 responses)

CATEGORY	Excellent 5	4	3	2	1	MEAN
organization	7	7	1	-	-	4.4
content	9	5	1	-	-	4.5
delivery	12	3	-	-	-	4.8
materials	-	-	-	-	-	(not applicable)
conceptual gain	8	5	1	-	-	4.5
practical gain	10	4	1	-	-	4.6

Comments:
--Simply marvelous. The type that would draw any student to her side with her boundless energy and magnetism.
--Barb came very prepared and knowledgeable of her program and the concerns in the community. She has a program almost complete in various different components, which will hold the interest of many students. Barb did a very good presentation and left me feeling better about dealing with the frustrations of the gifted program than I had felt before.
--A dynamic person with a dynamic program.

--She was excellent.
--I enjoyed her.
--Very good.
--Could have listened to her longer.
--A very high energy person--very impressive.
--Incredible the way one person does so much. I especially like the way she gives so many children chances to excel other than gifted classes.

Table 8

GLORIA DOWNING'S PRESENTATION
(14 responses)

CATEGORY	Excellent 5	4	3	2	Poor 1	MEAN
organization	13	1	-	-	-	4.9
content	12	2	-	-	-	4.9
delivery	10	3	1	-	-	4.6
materials	12	2	-	-	-	4.9
conceptual gain	11	2	-	-	-	4.8
practical gain	10	3	-	-	-	4.8

Comments:
--Knowledgeable.
--A very together lady. I would have liked more time with her.
--Very good.
--Very interesting.
--Nice activities
--Excellent presentation.

IV. TOTAL WORKSHOP - EDUCATORS

Results of the final summative evaluation of the Workshop by the educator group follows in Table 9.

Table 9

EDUCATOR EVALUATION OF TOTAL WORKSHOP

	EXCELLENT 5	4	3	2	POOR 1	MEAN
1. Organization of the workshop	12	1	-	-	-	4.9
2. Content of the workshop	13	-	-	-	-	5.0
3. Delivery of the workshop	11	2	-	-	-	4.8
4. Materials (visuals, handouts, etc.)	11	2	-	-	-	4.8
5. To what extent did the workshop meet the stated objectives?	11	2	-	-	-	4.8
6. To what extent has your conceptual knowledge increased?	11	2	-	-	-	4.8
7. To what extent has your practical knowledge increased?	9	4	-	-	-	4.7

Participants were asked to state what two things they considered strong points of the workshop and what two things should have been done differently in the workshop. Additional comments were also invited.

Strong Points

--Intelligent respect for complexity and the true, relative worth of others' contributions. Thorough preparation and articulate presentation.
--Dr. Renzulli. The simulation activity on identifying gifted students.
--Excellent speakers. Excellent handouts.
--Group activities and discussions. Speakers.
--The help I received to work with students in my room. Knowledge of G/T increased.
--Anita. Presentation and organization.
--Renzulli. Downing.
--Personality of leader. Guest speakers. Handouts. Movies.
--All of the above (evaluation form) considerations.
--The overall exposure of the subject matter. First-hand information e.g. Dr. Renzulli's visit.

--Guest speakers. Materials (handouts).
--Enjoyed the variety of media used. Additional speakers added much. Concepts presented were well explained.
--Personal concerns to awareness of persons involved. Completeness of topics.
--Very good.
--Thoroughly first-rate, thoughtful workshop, respecting complexity.
--Very beneficial.

Should Have Been Done Differently / Suggestion for Improvement

--Include more people if possible; it would have benefitted so many teachers. Maybe provisions for the upcoming year to get together again, coordinate efforts for the gifted, etc.
--Gloria (sentimental, superficial). Nothing.
--I would like to have seen more people from local areas and have their programs are set up (i.e. Barb Lavery). More films.
--Very little.
--None
--Had a "gifted" child visit. Joined both gifted workshops in one.
--Nothing. This was just what I wanted!
--More attention given to curricular/instructional provisions. Hopefully another workshop can cover these areas.
--Somewhat less lecture. Additional examples of materials now in print to use with gifted children would have been a good addition.
--I would like to see an extension of this inservice--indepth study of instructional curricular provisions for G/T.
--Not so close to school opening. Last week hectic!
--More outside speakers.
--I wish Gloria wouldn't 1) sit on the table in front of the overhead projector; 2) turn off the lights.

Other Comments

--Excellent workshop; the most outstanding educational experience I have had.
--Very good workshop. I enjoyed it very much and got a lot of information from it.
--This is the best workshop I have been involved in. Very interesting and informative.
--This inservice has turned on my light bulb. Thank you.
--I truly enjoyed and profited from the workshop. It will take a while to digest all the ideas and materials presented but I feel I have grown greatly from the experience. Thank you, sincerely!!
--I thoroughly enjoyed this workshop! Well organized. Very Informative.
--Very practical workshop!
--This inservice and activities have helped me to grow as a person. This was great!
--Outstanding inservice.

V. TOTAL WORKSHOP - PARENTS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS

Results of the final summative evaluation of the Workshop by the parents and community leaders follows in Table 10.

Table 10

PARENT/COMMUNITY LEADER EVALUATION OF TOTAL WORKSHOP

	EXCELLENT 5	4	3	2	POOR 1	MEAN
1. Organization of the workshop	5	-	-	-	-	5.0
2. Content of the workshop	5	-	-	-	-	5.0
3. Delivery of the workshop	5	-	-	-	-	5.0
4. Materials (visuals, handouts, etc.)	5	-	-	-	-	5.0
5. To what extent did the workshop meet the stated objectives?	5	-	-	-	-	5.0
6. To what extent has your conceptual knowledge increased?	3	2	-	-	-	4.6
7. To what extent has your practical knowledge increased?	3	2	-	-	-	4.6

Participants were asked to state what two things they considered strong points of the workshop and what two things would have been done differently in the workshop. Additional comments were also invited.

Strong Points

--The wealth of information that was explained. The manner in which this information was presented.
--The coordinator A. Todd. A. Todd's methods of presentation.
--Materials presented. Participants were made to feel relaxed and comfortable.
--The open discussion and freedom to voice opinions. The way in which so much was so effectively covered in the time allowed.
--Variety of guest speakers. We were not lectured to, but we were able to discuss as a group and explore many ideas.

Should Have Been Done Differently/Suggestions for Improvement

--This is the first inservice I've ever participated in so I really can't make a judgment.
--I cannot think of anything at this particular time.
--Possibly more publicity to encourage public to attend the session with Renzulli, especially those in the educational community.
--Time of summer could have been different, may have attracted more people.
--The only things lacking were more concerned citizens and parents to be made aware of the untapped resources walking around disguised as kids.

Other Comments

--This workshop offered many, many different ways and ideas of understanding giftedness and was most interesting as well as informative. This workshop also helped me see myself as a person and for this I will be forever thankful. (It helped me to grow intellectually.) Anita Todd was an excellent consultant who exuded a lot of warmth, which helped the whole learning process blossom.
--I only wish the workshop could have lasted longer.
--The workshop was extremely informative and beneficial to me. I looked forward to coming each evening. Not only did it increase my knowledge of G/T students and programs, but it also helped me with my children.
--This was probably the finest workshop I've ever attended. The two hours each evening flew, mostly because so much was covered without making participants feel inundated. The group was a big factor in that it "gelled", and that makes for free exchange and much more growth for all. Well done!
--Workshop was excellent. I feel I would liked to have spent more time and gone into more detail on some areas. We would discuss issues and two hours would seem too short. I would like to have had Dr. Renzulli do more on identifying disadvantaged and minority gifted.

APPENDIX A

Workshop Agenda
and
List of Participants

GIFTED AND TALENTED
EDUCATOR WORKSHOP

August 20-31, 1979
Mon. - Fri., 8:30-11:30 a.m.

Instructional Center
210 W. Cross, Ypsilanti

Monday, August 20

Group Information
Introductory Activities
Historical View of Gifted
Film: "Children of Promise"

Tuesday, August 21

Characteristics of the Gifted
Characteristics of Disadvantaged Gifted
Historical View of Disadvantaged Gifted
Film: "More Than a Glance"

Wednesday, August 22

Defining Gifted, Talented, Creative
Methods of Identifying Gifted
Philosophy (Rationale) for Differentiated Instruction
Differentiating Instruction: Administrative Provisions

Thursday, August 23

Enrichment Triad, Revolving Door Approach to Identification,
Developing Minority Group Talent
Dr. Joseph S. Renzulli
Professor of Educational Psychology
University of Connecticut

Friday, August 24

Overview of Project FOCUS
Bette Halman, Tom Tobias, Cheryl Wilbanks
Ypsilanti Public Schools
Learning Styles and the Gifted

Monday, August 27

Issues in Testing and Use of Test Data
Dr. Percy Bates
Associate Dean, School of Education
University of Michigan
The Lincoln Experience
Barbara Lavery, Gifted Teacher/Coordinator
Lincoln Public Schools

Tuesday, August 28

Identification Simulation
Differentiating Instruction: Curricular Provisions

Wednesday, August 29

Creativity: Who? What? When? Where? Why?
Gloria Downing, Gifted Consultant
Livingston Intermediate School District, Howell
Instructional Strategies and the Gifted

Thursday, August 30

Instructional Strategies and the Gifted (cont.)

Friday, August 31

Evaluation and Wrap-Up
Film: "Why Man Creates"

GIFTED AND TALENTED

PARENT-COMMUNITY LEADER WORKSHOP

August 20-30, 1979
Monday - Friday, 7:00 - 9:00 p.m.

Instructional Center
210 W. Cross
Ypsilanti

Monday, August 20

Group Information
Introductory Activities
Historical View of Gifted
Film: "Children of Promise"

Tuesday, August 21

Characteristics of the Gifted
Characteristics of Disadvantaged Gifted
Historical View of Disadvantaged Gifted
Film: "More Than a Glance"

Wednesday, August 22

Enrichment Triad, Revolving Door Approach to Identification, Developing Minority Group Talent
Dr. Joseph S. Renzulli
Professor of Educational Psychology
University of Connecticicut

Thursday, August 23

Overview of Project FOCUS
Bette Halman, Tom Tobias, Cheryl Wilbanks
Ypsilanti Public Schools
Philosophy (Rationale) for Differentiated Instruction

Friday, August 24

Methods of Identifying Gifted
Differentiating Instruction: Administrative Provisions
Differentiating Instruction: Curricular Provisions

* * * * * * * * *

Monday, August 27

Issues in Testing and Use of Test Data
Dr. Percy Bates
Associate Dean, School of Education
University of Michigan

The Lincoln Experience
Barbara Lavery, Gifted Teacher/Coordinator
Lincoln Public Schools

Tuesday, August 28

Creativity: Who? What? When? Where? Why?
Gloria Downing, Gifted Consultant
Livingston Intermediate School District

Wednesday, August 29

Identification Simulation
Learning Styles and the Gifted

Thursday, August 30

Instructional Strategies and the Gifted

Friday, August 31

Evaluation and Wrap-Up
Film: "Why Man Creates"

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Teachers

Name	School
1. Britton, Marlene	Erickson
2. Dykman, Barbara	Ardis
3. Garland, Dave	Ardis
4. Guthrie, Gwen	Adams
5. Halman, Bette	George (Focus)
6. Hayden, Deborah	Estabrook
7. Kacanek, Martha	Ardis
8. Lai, Shirley	Chapelle
9. Plummer, Hazel	Adams
10. Rice, Peggy	Perry CDC
11. Taylor, Yvonne	Estabrook
12. Tobias, Tom	George (Focus)
13. Weisman, Donna	Adams
14. Wilbanks, Cheryl	George (Focus)

Parents/Community Leaders

1. Barnard, Gail E.	School Board
2. Davis, Julia P.	Parent
3. Lounsberry, Sally	Parent
4. Robinson, Mary R.	Parent
5. Stanford, Adrian	Parent/Director of Girls' Club

APPENDIX B

Assessment and Evaluation Instruments

G/T STAFF DEVELOPMENT
Awareness Level - Assessment

CIRCLE the letter in front of the response that is most appropriate to your knowledge or feelings at this time.

1. Level of knowledge of the concepts of 'giftedness', i.e. definition, characteristics, identification

   A. I do not have any background in this area.
   B. I have a fair understanding, but I need to know more.
   C. I feel fairly confident of my understanding of the concepts.
   D. I have a strong background in the area of G/T.

2. Level of knowledge of the rationale (philosophy) for differentiated provisions for the education of gifted students

   A. I do not have any background in this area.
   B. I have a fair understanding, but I need to know more.
   C. I feel fairly confident of my understanding.
   D. I feel ready to support a particular philosophy regarding G/T.

3. Level of knowledge of ways to provide quality differentiated programs for gifted and talented students

   A. I do not have any background in this area.
   B. I have a fair understanding, but I need to know more.
   C. I feel fairly confident of my understanding.
   D. I have sufficient knowledge, and I feel ready to initiate some program elements.

4. Level of commitment to district-wide emphasis on provisions for gifted and talented students

   A. I do not have sufficient data for assessment at this time.
   B. I am not committed.
   C. I am open to the process and planning, but I am not committed.
   D. I am committed, but I still have some reservations.
   E. I am fully committed.

5. Level of commitment to specific provisions for gifted and talented students with whom I am directly or indirectly involved

   A. I do not have sufficient data for assessment at this time.
   B. I am not committed.
   C. I am open to the process and planning, but I am not committed.
   D. I am committed, but I still have some reservations.
   E. I am fully committed.

6. COMMENTS: _____

_____

GD/AT:1978

Please respond to the following items by checking (√) the response that is most appropriate to your knowledge and feelings at this time.

I do not have any background in this area.	I have a fair understanding but need to know more.	I feel fairly confident of my understanding of this.	I have strong background in this area.	
				1. Characteristics of the gifted
				2. Characteristics of disadvantaged gifted
				3. Methods of identifying gifted
				4. Differentiated provisions for gifted: Administrative
				5. Differentiated provisions for gifted: Curricular
				6. Differentiated provisions for gifted: Instructional
				7. Assessing learning styles
				8. Creativity (what it is; how it can be fostered)
				9. Inquiry process or teaching style
				10. Questioning strategies to encourage higher level thinking skills
				11. Future problem solving
				12. Structure of the Intellect

Place an X in front of each name you recognize, i.e. you know something about this person's contribution (theory, writings, etc.) to the education of gifted students.

_____Terman	_____Marland	_____C. Taylor
_____Binet	_____Meeker	_____F. Williams
_____Bloom	_____Gallagher	_____Renzulli
_____Krathwohl	_____Sisk	_____Feldhusen
_____Guilford	_____Torrance	_____Kaplan

What do you expect to gain from this workshop?_____

_____

_____

SPEAKER EVALUATION FORM

CIRCLE the number which most closely describes your feelings on the scale of 5 to 1 with the descriptors given.

Excellent				Poor
5	4	3	2	1
Considerably				Very little

Speaker: _____

1.	Organization	5	4	3	2	1
2.	Content	5	4	3	2	1
3.	Delivery	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Materials	5	4	3	2	1
5.	Gain in conceptual knowledge	5	4	3	2	1
6.	Gain in practical knowledge	5	4	3	2	1

Comments: _____

_____

_____

G/T STAFF DEVELOPMENT
Awareness Level - Evaluation
(For use when awareness level training is complete)

CIRCLE the number which most closely describes your feelings on the scale of 5 to 1, with the descriptors given.

1. To what extent has your knowledge of the concepts of 'giftedness' increased, i.e. definition, characteristics, and identification?

Greatly		Somewhat		Very limited
5	4	3	2	1

2. To what extent has your knowledge of the rationale (philosophy) for differentiated provisions for the education of gifted and talented students increased?

5 4 3 2 1

3. To what extent has your knowledge of ways to provide quality differentiated programs for G/T students increased?

5 4 3 2 1

4. What is your present level of commitment to district-wide emphasis on provisions for G/T students?

Fully committed				Not committed
5	4	3	2	1

5. What is your present level of commitment to specific provisions for G/T students with whom you are directly or indirectly involved?

5 4 3 2 1

6. What is your overall evaluation of the awareness level inservice activities?

Excellent				Poor
5	4	3	2	1

7. Comments and/or suggestions for improvement of particular inservice activities? _____

_____

8. OTHER COMMENTS: _____

_____

GD/AT:1978

WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

CIRCLE the number which most closely describes your feelings on the scale of 5 to 1, with the descriptors given.

		Excellent				Poor
1.	The organization of the workshop was:	5	4	3	2	1
2.	The content of the workshop was:	5	4	3	2	1
3.	The delivery of the workshop was:	5	4	3	2	1
4.	The materials (visuals, handouts, etc.) used were:	5	4	3	2	1

		Considerably				Very Little
5.	To what extent did the workshop meet the stated objectives?	5	4	3	2	1
6.	To what extent has your conceptual knowledge increased?	5	4	3	2	1
7.	To what extent has your practical knowledge increased?	5	4	3	2	1

8. What 2 things do you consider the strong points of the workshop?

9. What 2 things should have been done differently in the workshop?

10. Other comments:

APPENDIX C

Poem by Workshop Participant

Let our voices be heard
Quit holding us back
Bridle your fears
Give us some slack

Legal battles Tasters choice
People are beginning to hear our voice
Bask in our light
Learn how to grow
The process at times is painfully slow

A concerted effort is needed
to keep the paths clear
Let our schools know
The Gifted and Talented are here!

JPD
8/23/79